DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 726 CS 504 424

AUTHOR Edwards, Christie Lou
TITLE Censorship in Schools: A Missouri Community's Experience.
INSTITUTION Freedom of Information Center, Columbia, Mo.
REPORT NO FOI-480
PUB DATE Sep 83
NOTE 9p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; *Board of Education Role; *Censorship; Court Litigation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Materials; Parent Role; Parent School Relationship; Reading Material Selection; School Community Relationship; Social Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Freedom of Information; Missouri

ABSTRACT

When parents called for the removal of certain classroom and library materials from the Mexico, Missouri, public schools in 1982, the Mexico Board of Education unanimously refused their request. After separate complaints about the magazine "Humanist," a film of Shirley Jackson's story "The Lottery," as well as her book "The Lottery: Adventures of a Demon Lover," and another book entitled "Julie of the Wolves" were rejected by an established review committee, the school board became the parents' last forum for local appeal. The complaints and subsequently formed parent-watchdog groups in Mexico reflected a national trend. A poll on censorship related issues indicated that (1) challenges to classroom and library materials occurred in more than one in five public schools between 1978 and 1980; (2) challengers had not fully read or viewed the materials cited as objectionable in one third of the cases; (3) more than one half of the challenges resulted in the removal, restriction, or limited availability of materials; and (4) challenges to schools with formal written selection and removal policies--like Mexico--were more likely to be overruled. While possibly stemming the flood of challenges to school districts' control over reading materials, the Supreme Court's 1982 Island Trees, New York, decision giving school boards only limited discretion in removing library books failed to provide guidelines for removal of materials and did not influence procensorship decisions of many lower courts. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

FOI

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI AT COLUMBIA
SEPTEMBER, 1983

ED236726

CENSORSHIP IN SCHOOLS:

A MISSOURI COMMUNITY'S EXPERIENCE

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION CENTER REPORT NO. 480

This report was written by Christie Lou Edwards, a master's candidate at the University of Missouri School of Journalism.

Good Time Sam's in Mexico, Missouri, echoes with what sounds like organ chords being forced through a meat grinder. Mike Hendrick and Fernando Rendell both stand engrossed in the bezerk cacophony of noises and lights in the video game arcade.

The 14-year-old Mexico students would chat, but they knew nothing of unsuccessful censorship attempts in town in the summer of 1982. Nor could they articulate the rights guaranteed by the First Amendment.[1]

Both students tried to help, but they were not totally sure what a censor was.Mike said the junior high school principal took a book away from him one day last year, but returned it when school let out.[2]

Mike's uncle said he could borrow that book. Mike said the principal objected to some scattered "dirty words" within it.[3]

Outside Mexico Junior High School, four eighth-graders all said parents should decide what their children read. All were stymied when a questioner asked who should decide when parents disagree.[4]

Only Lisa Gibbons, 13, could articulate a solution. She said teachers should send notes to parents if required classroom materials might prove objectionable. Parents, she said, could then have their children excused from certain assignments or classes if they so wished.[5]

Six teen-agers were all polled randomly. By December of 1982, not one of them knew what many of their fellow townspeople talked about six months earlier.

Mexico and Audrain County residents then gossiped about censorship at bridge games.[6] An evangelist spoke against secular humanism and for parents' rights at a local revival.[7] School board members, reporters, administrators and a TV crew crammed into a tension-filled board room and overwhelmed the air conditioner.[8]

By the end of the year, the issue was cold–either dead or submerged. But the submerged censorship issue is growing like a thickening iceberg. A parent who called for book banning during the summer said she will never give up the fight. A school board member who voted against censorship said she hoped it is all over.[9] School board minutes show no parental appeals after August, 1982 and the school board member said none was pending before the district's review committee.[10] Waitresses, motel clerks and store cashiers knew nothing of the affair.

The state-publicized rift between Mexico School District No. 59 and protesting parents left scars among participants. Mexico parents called for the removal of a magazine, a film and two library books from Mexico public schools during that summer. The Mexico Board of Education unanimously turned them down.[11]

The most persistent parents involved were Mrs. Joan Lauterbach and Mrs. Linda Baysinger. Mrs. Lauterbach consulted with Mrs. Baysinger before declining an interview request for both of them. She said the media have been inaccurate and unfair.[12]

Complaints about instructional materials in Mexico public schools date back to the fall of 1981. Parental protests arose separately, but the school board heard appeals during one summer. Mrs. Lauterbach helped create Citizens for Academic Excellence when like-minded parents discovered each other.[13]

Summary:

Efforts to control the content of literature in schools continue unabated. The brief storm which hit Mexico, Missouri, during the summer of 1982 over demands for the removal of a magazine, a film and two books from the town's public schools is indicative of a national trend.

CS 504424

Citizens for Academic Excellence may be more of a state of mind than an active entity. A local pastor said the group never really got organized.[14] Mrs. Lauterbach did not number members, but a mailing list compiled during the summer of 1982 included about 80 interested parents.

The Mexico school board adopted detailed policies for the selection and removal of instructional materials long before official complaints were made. For the first time, a review committee met in 1981 to consider formal parental complaints about materials in an elementary school, the junior high school and the high school.[15]

Serving on that committee were a parent, an elementary school teacher, the junior high school principal, the high school librarian and the assistant superintendent.[16] When the review committee said "no" on all complaints, the school board became the parents' last forum for local appeal.

COMPLAINTS STACKED UP

The complaints stacked up like this:

-Mary and Eugene Taylor objected to articles within the **Humanist** magazine, available for student research at Mexico High School. Their daughter checked out the magazine to do research for a speech class.[17]

-The Taylors objected in particular to an illustrated articles about how pornography desensitizes people to sexual violence.[18] They called for removal of the magazine on ideological grounds.

The Taylors believe strongly in God,[19] and the **Humanist** stresses man's autonomy and scientific achievement.

-Mrs. Lauterbach, Mrs. Baysinger and Mrs. Julie Chavarria led those who objected to two library books and a film shown to nearly all eighth-graders at Mexico Junior High School.

-The women objected to **Julie and the Wolves,** a book Mrs. Lauterbach's fourth-grader selected when a federally funded reading program for gifted children still existed.[20] They found an attempted marriage consummation between a teen-aged Eskimo couple particularly objectionable. **Julie and the Wolves,** by Jean George, won a Newberry Award in 1973. Newberry Awards for excellence in children's literature have been presented since 1922.[21]

-Shirley Jackson's book **The Lottery: Adventures of a Demon Lover** also disturbed parents. Protestors questioned if the gothic horror stories within the book are appropriate for 11- to 13-year-olds.[22]

-The mothers and other community representatives objected as well to a film made from a Jackson short story called "The Lottery."[23] The film tells the story of a human sacrifice tradition in a rural community. The sacrifice supposedly helps crops grow. No actual violence is shown, but the film ends when a child is handed a stone, which he will presumably throw at his mother.

Censorship of the film apparently drew more community support than any other one target. During the spring of 1982, a school board member joined about 40 people at a community screening. She found herself the only one present who did not favor censorship.[24]

The board's only concession to the parents was a suggestion that parents be notified before the "The Lottery" is shown.[25]

Not all those parents who addressed the school board had children in the public schools. The Rev. C.F. Skelton, who runs a private Christian school in Mexico, said parents should censor their children's reading and viewing materials in order to raise them in the path they should follow.[26]

"It's not God-glorifying," Skelton said of a child's exposure to the materials...The Bible says we are to think of things that are good and pure, and let the mind that's in Christ be in us."[27]

Skelton established the Ole Country Church in Mexico five years ago. He headed an independent Baptist congregation of about 40. Children in his school, he explained, learn the difference between right and wrong.[28]

He did not launch the censorship effort, but he spoke in favor of it before the school board. His educational philosophy is in line with the ideas expressed by concerned parents.

He believes, for instance, that religious training and educational training need not be separated. Three of the protesting parents, in an action that illustrates a similar belief, publicly asked God to guide the school board's decision.[29] One couple invited a pastor to a review committee meeting.[30] Skelton backs the belief of several parents that secular humanism is an evil.[31]

Mrs. Ann Decker, the newest member on the Mexico school board, also believes in God, yet she voted against censorship. She agrees that parents should censor the influences upon their children – particularly very young children.[32] Her family is Presbyterian.

Instructional materials, she felt, should be carefully selected. "I'd be a great defender of First Amendment rights," she said, "but there is a difference in a public school library."[33]

But that careful parental eye, Mrs. Decker felt, should become less strict as children get older and more interested in the world–and more capable of dealing with it. Most importantly to Ann Decker, children should be actively encouraged to read.[34]

Mrs. Decker's living room is lined with books. Books were scatered throughout the house where she grew up. "Reading is very important to me," she stressed. "Otherwise, I won't feel so strongly about it."[35]

She did find one **Humanist** article "trashy". Nothing else she studied during the summer of 1982, however, seemed to merit the drastic measure of removal–and a study of six or eight **Humanist** magazines convinced her that the publication as a whole has educational value. She said town opinion ran "overwhelmingly in favor of academic freedom."[36]

Mrs. Decker grew up in Mexico. Skelton established a church and a school there. Both can influence–and are influenced by–their surroundings.

THE BACKGROUND

Mexico is farm country,located in the center of rich Audrain County. Barn signs boast of state-renowned[37] sad-

dlehorses. Green and yellow tractors brighten a sales lot near town limits. Morning coffee-drinkers wear duck-billed tractor caps. Audrain County is fifth in state soybean and grain sorgum production, and sixth in corn production.[38] The town's agricultural roots are obvious.

Less obvious – but nevertheless discernible – is the quiet influence of a strong Christian heritage in a region some believe falls within the indefinite boundaries of the Bible Belt.

Winter or summer, the welcome sign on Missouri 54 always reads the same: "Jesus Makes Life Worth Living." In j zytern Mexico, the sign in front of the United Pentacostal Church says: "Home of the Old Time Religion."Downtown, a local motorist cruises around a dawdler in Mexico's rectangular business district. His bumper sticker read: "God said it; I believed it; And that settled it."

The tall shape on the downtown skyline looked an embracing crowd of paper towel rolls. This is the MFA Grain and Feed Division, another example of the town's agricultural roots. Another skyline breaker is the brown, symmetrical jab of the steeple on the First Presbyterian Church. Here was more concrete evidence of the Christian influence.

But neither Mexico nor Audrain county is behind the times. Television antennae pole from most town and county roofs. Restaurants include the McDonald's, Hardee's and Pizza Huts of the big cities. Youngsters wear the latest fashions or the blue jeans popular nationwide.

At the same time, Mexico residents are seeped in the Christian values of a small agricultural community. This is Middle America, where most people believe strongly in God. Church congregations formed almost contemporaneously as pioneers settled the county in the 1820s.[39] Wqbgwin County officially organized in 1836–four years after the first school house was constructed.[40] Today's teacher may put a wildcat in his tank at lunch time, but an earlier teacher actually killed one at noon.[41]

An incident reported in 1840 reflects the Christian character of the community. Guns were heard in Mexico that year. A man on horseback warned surrounding families that Mormons were killing everybody in town. Men, women and children for eight or 10 miles around were "fleeing in every direction, believing that the Mormons were determined to slaughter them."[42]

Later, the shaken farming community learned that a company of soldiers had embarked on an expedition to drive Mormons from the state. They staged a sham battle along the way.[43]

By 1884, the county had 41 churches–fifteen Baptist, eleven Christian, seven Methodist, six Presbyterian, one Episcopalian and one Roman Catholic.[44]

While the religious heritage of the county gained influence, the secular aspects also gained a toehold. James Fenton, for instance, opened Mexico's first tavern in 1836.[45] Four years later, Milroy Powell was found guilty of fourth-degree manslaughter for conking George Eubanks over the head with a weeding hoe. Powell was fined $325 and sentenced to six months in jail.

As colorful as it is, Mexico's history is no more distinctive or religious than that of numerous other communities with pioneer roots and agriculture-based economies. Censorship can happen anywhere. Mexico's brief stint in the media spotlight makes it neither unique nor a state aberration.

It happens in the small towns of Middle America and in the large suburbs of New York. Mexico's censorship story is part of a national trend.

THE NATIONAL SCENE

Groups like Citizens for Academic Excellence are forming all over the United States. They have names like Young Parents Alert, People Concerned with Education and Guardians of Education.[46]

Citizens for Academic Excellence is an independent group, but other national consevative groups are backed by the Moral Majority, Eagle Forum or the Christian Broadcasting Network.[47] These national groups can exercise great influence.

The Moral Majority, for instance, is credited with a definite influence on the 1980 conservative sweep in national elections.[48] In 1982, that loose alliance of pressure groups had a budget of $5.6 million. Membership is placed at four million, but liberals dispute that figure. Hard-core contributors are numbered at 400,000.[49]

A spokesman at the American Library Association's Office for Intellectual Freedom credits the Moral Majority with single-handedly pushing national censorship attempt tallies up significantly during the academic year 1980-81. The spokesman said Moral Majority sponsored a mass mailing against the book **Our Bodies, Ourselves. Reported censorship attempts rose correspondingly that year.**[50]

The Moral Majority's increased clout is evidently an influence in Mexico.

One parent urged the school board to subscribe to the **Moral Majority Report** and **Christianity Today** to balance liberal publications like the **Humanist**. Skelton said the Moral Majority does good work and wished its members well.[51]

Conservative evangelists, backed by the Moral Majority, have identified secular humanism as an evil to be vigorously challenged. The Rev. Bill Bennett of Arkansas said teachers have been saturated with the man-as-a-supreme-being concept.[52]

Evolution can be taught, Bennett lamented in one sermon, but the concept of sin is taboo. The conservatives vigorously fight the idea that human reason is supreme. It is, "...the battle of the church and of the people of God," Bennett said in one sermon. "It's a battle against Satan and darkness."[53]

Censorship attempts of all kinds have risen steadily since 1966,[54] but the increase became dramatic after President Ronald Reagan's election in 1980. For the 1979-80 reporting period, the Office for Intellectual Freedom recorded slightly more than 300 challenges. For the 1980-81 reporting period, that figure jumped to nearly 1,000 challenges.[55] The spokesman said 70 to 80 percent of all challenges are directed at school libraries.

The spokesman for the Office for Intellectual Freedom says most challenges come from individuals,[56] but another study indicates that groups like Citizens for Academic Excellence are becoming markedly more numerous.

In 1982, 860 United States librarians were polled on censorship-related issues.Seventeen percent of them said groups like Citizens for Academic Excellence existed within their communities. In a similar poll conducted in 1977, fewer than one percent reported the presence of such groups.[57]

Results from a more comprehensive survey indicate there were challenges to classroom or library materials in more than one in five public schools during the academic years between 1978 and 1980.[58]

Sponsors were the Association of American Publishers, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the American Library Association. Nearly 1,900 school officials and librarians were polled in 50 states.[59]

The study indicated:

-That challengers tried to limit information and viewpoints available to students in 95 percent of the cases cited.[60]

-That suburbs and cities with a population between 50,000 and 500,000 were more likely to experience challenges than towns the size of Mexico.[61]

-That school officials said challenges had not read or viewed the materials in full in nearly a third of the cases.[62]

-That more than half of the challenges resulted in the removal, restriction or limited availability of materials.[63]

-That schools with formal written selection and removal policies–like Mexico–were more frequently overruled.[64]

In Mexico, Skelton, who was not a formal challenger, read only "sketches" of **Julie and the Wolves.** "I don't have to read the whole thing to find out there's some things not good in it," he said.[65]

Librarians stress that school districts should adopt and follow formal policies for selections and complaints. No books or school materials, then, would be removed unless a school board majority votes to do so.[66]

One expert says the word "censorship" carries too many negative connotations to accurately portray many of the protests launched. "Challenges to materials have a positive, legitimate function in a democratic educational system,"according to the author of the ALA study.[67]

Skelton argues that censorship of various kinds is all around us. Public school teachers, he said, censor materials every day–mostly those kinds of materials consevatives espouse. But the primary censors in the United States, he added, are also among the most vigorous champions of anti-censorship.

"The news media are the greatest censors in America," Skelton argued. "They censor more every day than most people do in a lifetime."[68]

Liberals and moderates like Mrs. Decker took heart from the 1982 Island Trees decision handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court, in a five-to-four ruling, said school boards have only limited discretion to remove books from high school and junior high school libraries.[69] After that decision, a Long Island school board returned nine books to a library, in part because the Court held that political motivations may have prompted the removal.

But the fragmented, highly factional Island Trees decision charts no clear guidelines for school boards on what may constitute a legitimate reason to remove a book, and classroom material removals are not addressed at all. Nevertheless, a liberal publication[70] and an American Civil Liberties Union attorney both called the decision a significant victory.[71]

By late November in New York, the parents in the Island Trees school district still were being notified whenever a child checked out one of the nine controversial books.[72] Conservatives sneered at the idea that children have the right to receive information and ideas. One columnist called the plurality opinion "ludicrous," and laconically commented: "This, too, will pass away."[73]

If liberals draw heart from the Island Trees decision, conservatives may find future ammunition in a related appellate court dismissal. In 1980, the second U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals held for a school board on the very day judges remanded the Long Island case for trial.[74]

In the little-publicized Vermont case, the appeals court upheld a school board's right to remove two books from a high school library. The board objected to "vulgar" and "indecent language" within the books.[75]

The Vermont school board followed the detailed policies librarians recommend for selection and removal of school materials. Thus, unless the Supreme Court rules otherwise, it may be legal for a school board to remove materials as long as no impermissible desire to suppress ideas exists.[76]

In Missouri, Skelton said winning the Mexico school board over to the parents' cause may be impossible, but he and other protestors planned to continue to voice objections.[77] Yet, Mrs. Decker said she might vote for parents if a stronger case comes before the board in the future.[78]

In Mexico and elsewhere, then, the removal of instructional materials from public schools could become increasingly likely if parents become more organized.

The Island Trees decision may be stemming the flood of challenges, but 1982 statistics on censorship in the United States are holding steady when 1982 figures are compared with those of 1981.[79]

In June, 1982, for instance, a book review committee in Lakeland, Fla., voted to remove Kurt Vonnegut's **Slaughterhouse Five** from a high school library.[80] Three months later, parents in Cotatiti, Calif., filed a formal appeal against Judy Blume's books, **Deenie** and **Forever.**[81]

In Carlsbad, N.M., 100 copies of the Merriam-Webster New Collegiate Dictionary were removed from classrooms because a parent complained about the obscene words within them.[82] The list goes on.

According to one study, the film **The Lottery,** which generated such protest in Mexico, was the fifth most challenged item between 1976 and 1980. **Go Ask Alice** prompted the most challenges, with **Catcher in the Rye, Our Bodies, Ourselves** and the film **Deep Throat** also placing within the top five.[83]

Of the materials challenged in Mexico, only **The Lottery** had been challenged elsewhere between 1976 and 1980. The film drew some protest between 1966 and 1975, but did not place within the 10-most-censored-materials list.[84]

Top targets in 1981 and 1982 were a number of Judy Blume books and the book **Our Bodies, Ourselves.**[85]

Missouri is not particularly censorship-prone. Dr. L.B. Woods, editor of **Current Studies in Librarianship,** places Missouri's censorship rate at 28 percent below the national average in a study done for the years between 1976 and 1980.[86] A related study indicates that states in the Pacific

northwest and in New England were more often sites of censorship efforts for the same period.[87]

Robert Doyle, assistant to the director in the Office for Intellectual Freedom, estimated that 85 percent of all censorship challenges may not even be reported in newspapers.[88] The office depends upon telephone calls and news reports for information.

In brief, nobody knows how many censorship attempts there are in the United States each year--but the number of them reported are definitely increasing.

Does the national trend mean Americans are returning to traditional and more conservative values? Skelton hoped so.

"I don't know if traditional American values ever went away," Mrs Decker said. "They just kind of got obscured a little bit."[89]

CONCLUSION

Ann Decker confiscated a paperback book from her 14-year-old daughter in Mexico during the fall of 1982. Her teenager bought the book at a local store. Mrs. Decker objected to the "perverted sex" within it. She threw it away.

Mrs. Decker's two older daughters are adults, but she still plays the role of parental censor at times for the youngest. This points to Skelton's argument.Censorship is all around us.

Possibly because she censors what her children read, Mrs. Decker can empathize with Mexico's protesting parents. "I disagree with them, but I understand," she said.[90]

To Skelton, it was a matter of conservative parents and their children being bombarded with "trash" from every direction.

Mrs. Decker attended school with Mary Taylor, who then was Mary Zeigler. The Zeigler children did not attend school parties or view films because the family had strong religious beliefs. Mrs. Decker said it never caused the least bit of trouble.

Today, according to Mrs. Decker, a child in Mexico may be excused from a particular activity if a parent voices objections. She advocates compromise.

The Mexico-area native won her school board seat in 1982, defeating a conservative candidate in the process. Kenneth C. Lauterbach, Mrs. Lauterbach' husband, was among three losing candidates. He won fewer than half the votes Mrs. Decker did.[91]

Local taxes fund about 45 percent of the Mexico school district's $6.5 million operating budget. About 2,299 students attend local schools.[92]

Should the parents of those children want conservative instructional materials, they could easily vote Mrs. Decker out. "If they think it's all right, they can pay for it themselves," Skelton said. "Why should I have to pay for it if I don't like it?"[93]

He suggested that parents who want their children to read such "controversial" materials should send them to the public library--if they can justify the presence of the materials there.

The film, **The Lottery**, however, was not controversial in Mexico until 1982. Carol Kieninger, a teacher at Mexico Junior High School, said she had shown the film for eight or nine years. Only three or four students had declined to watch.[94]

Her eighth-graders study short stories throughout the year. **The Lottery**, based on a short stroy, demonstrates three methods by which an author may develop characterization. "They see a lot worse on TV," she commented on the charge that the film is violent.[95]

Due to the controversy and the publicity, parents could have been invited to screen **The Lottery** and other films so they would know if they wanted their children to watch.

Mrs. Decker said other teachers have been disrupted or placed "on edge" by protesting parents. One parent, she added, construed a comment about the growth of megalopoles to mean that the teacher supported population control.[96]

Yet when conservative parents try to express their viewpoints in any way, Skelton went on, they are frequently scorned by liberals. Liberals, he explained, don't think about God.[97]

Skelton saw the Mexico censorship furor of 1982 as more of a moral issue than strictly a religious one. But religious references frequently crept into his answers.

He kept an American flag on his lapel and a Bible close at hand. Mrs. Decker kept a book of famous paintings on her coffee table. Both have three children. Both cared what happens to children. Both believed fervently that they were right.

If Mrs. Decker had a choice between her child reading a book and not reading at all, she would say read it.[98] If Skelton had the same choice, he would say "no."[99]

Separation of church and state, Skelton said, is not necessarily the answer to problems. "Our first schools were held in churches," he pointed out. "Our first teachers were pastors. Our first textbook was the Bible. And we turned out to be a pretty good country."[100]

Skelton and Mrs. Decker looked at the nation's heritage differently. He liked the way schools were run in an earlier period. She liked the individual rights guaranteed under the First Amendment.

But the basic difference between the groups for whom they spoke was a difference in a way of looking at the world. Skelton saw black and white. Mrs. Decker saw shades of gray.

Skelton believed in moral absolutes. "Sin has always been sin, that's it," he argued. "Right has always been right and wrong has always been wrong."[101]

On the other hand, Decker believed decisions about right and wrong depend upon the circumstances. "Never say never," she counselled.[102]

Censorship is nothing new. People have challenged the works of Plato, Dante, Shakespeare, Michelangelo and too many modern writers and artists to count.[103] Where it will lead in the United States will depend upon which philosophy gains the upper hand.

Two talented writers were able to sum the whole national disagreement up in a paragraph or two.

Msgr. Joseph Howard was executive secretary of the Roman Catholic National Office for Decent Literature when he spoke on the possible influences instructional materials may have on a child: "Is it unreasonable to argue, then, that if a

devotional can inspire, the works of de Sade can degrade? If a medium can sell Cadillacs to a man, can it not peddle contraceptives to his son? If a biography can make a youngster want to be a Mickey Mantle or a Jack the Ripper? If a masterpiece of art can bring a lump to the throat, couldn't a different picture produce a different reaction?"[104]

A district court judge spoke for those who believed otherwise in 1976, after encouraging students to find the "magic of the library."

"The most effective antidote to the poison of mindless orthodoxy is ready access to a broad sweep of ideas and philosophies," wrote District Judge Joseph Tauro. "There is no danger in such exposure. The danger is in mind control."[105]

FOOTNOTES

1. Interview with Mike Hendrick and Fernando Rendell, Good Time Sam's, Mexico, Mo., 4 Dec. 1982.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Interview with Lisa Gibbons, et al, Mexico Junior High School, Mexico, Mo., 2 Dec. 1982.
5. Ibid.
6. Interview with Ann Decker, 1602 Meadowlark Road, Mexico, Mo., 2 Dec. 1982.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Mexico School District No. 59, official minutes, August to November, 1982.
11. **Columbia Missourian**, 19 Aug. 1982.
12. Telephone interview with Joan Lauterbach, Mexico, Mo., 2 Dec. 1982. (Mrs. Lauterbach declined a formal interview, but did comment briefly via telephone.).
13. **Columbia Missourian**, 22 July 1982.
14. Interview with C.F. Skelton, Ole Country Church, Mexico, Mo., 5 Dec. 1982.
15. Decker interview.
16. Ibid.
17. **Columbia Missourian**, 22 July 1982.
18. Decker interview.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid.
21. Notes, Children's Literature class, Metropolitan State College, Denver, Colo., 1979.
22. **Columbia Tribune**, 19 Aug. 1982.
23. **Columbia Missourian**, 18 July 1982.
24. Decker interview.
25. Ibid.
26. Skelton interview.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid.
29. **Mexico Ledger**, 22 July 1982.
30. Decker interview.
31. Skelton interview.
32. Decker interview.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid.
36. Ibid.
37. **Johnson's 1980 Telephone Locator for Mexico, Mo.**, p. iii.
38. Ibid, p. iii.
39. **History of Audrain County, Missouri**. St. Louis: National Historical Co., 1884, p. 400.
40. Ibid, p. 178-179, 95.
41. Ibid, p. 178p179.
42. Ibid, pp. 346-347.
43. Ibid.
44. Ibid, pp. 400-415.
45. Ibid, p. 110.
46. Dena Kleiman, "Parent's Group Purging Schools of Humanist Books and Classics," **New York Times Book Review**, p. 1.
47. Ibid.
48. "As Moral Majority Girds for '82 Elections," **U.S. News & World Report**, 21 June 1982, p. 43.
49. "Just What is the Moral Majority?" **U.S. News and World Report**, 21 June 1982, p. 44.
50. Interview with Robert Doyle, American Library Association's Office of Intellectual Freedom, Chicago, Ill., 19 Nov. 1982.
51. Skelton interview.
52. "Secular Humanism, America's Most Dangerous Religion," **The Humanist**, March/April 1982, 42-45.
53. Ibid, p. 45.
54. L.B. Woods, **A Decade to Censorship in America**. (New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1979), p. 40.
55. Doyle interview.
56. Ibid.
57. **Mexico Ledger**, 27 November 1982.
58. Michelle Kamhi and the Association of American Publishers, the American Library Association and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981, p. 3.
59. Ibid, p. 1-2.
60. Ibid, p. 4.
61. Ibid, p. 3.
62. Ibid, p. 5.
63. Ibid, p. 7.
64. Ibid. p. 6.
65. Skelton interview.
66. Kamhi study, 9 23.
67. Michele Kamhi, "Censorship vs. Selection — Choosing Books for School," **American Education**, March 1982, p. 12.
68. Skelton interview.
69. **Board of Education, Island Trees Union Free School District No. 26 et al. vs. Steven A. Pico**, 50 U.S. Law week 4831, 25 June 1982, p. 2.
70. "The Supreme Court's Decision in Island Trees," **Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom**, September 1982, p. 1.
71. Interview with Arthur Eisenberg, New York ACLU, New York, N.Y., 19 Nov. 1982.
72. Ibid.
73. James Kirkpatrick, **Chicago-Sun Times**, 3 July 1982.
74. **David Bicknell vs. Vergennes Union High School Board of Directors**, 638 F.2d 438 (1980).
75. Ibid.
76. Ibid.
77. Skelton interview.
78. Decker interview.
79. Doyle interview.
80. **Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom**, September 1982, p. 155.
81. **Newsltter on Intellectual Freedom**, November 1982, p. 205.
82. **Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom**, November 1982, p. 206.
83. L.B. Woods, "Censorship: Changing Reality," unpublished article, 1981, p. 9.
84. Woods book, pp. 90-91.
85. Doyle interview.
86. L.B. Woods, "Fires in Missouri," **School and Community**, May 1982, p. 21.
87. Unpublished Woods article, p. 4.
88. Doyle interview.
89. Decker interview.
90. Ibid.
91. Mexico school board minutes.
92. Decker interview.
93. Skelton interview.
94. Interview with Carol Kieninger, Columbia, Mo., 2 Dec. 1982.
95. Ibid.
96. Decker interview.
97. Ibid.
98. Ibid.
99. Skelton interview.
100. Ibid.
101. Ibid.
102. Decker interview.
103. Harold Hart, ed. **Censorship; For and Against**. (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1971), p. 6-7.
104. Ibid, p. 31.
105. **Right to Read Defense Committee of Chelsa vs. School Committee of the City of Chelsa**, 454 F. Supp. 703 (D. Mass. 1978) at 715.

Below is a list of the most recent **Freedom of Information Reports** available for purchase. A complete listing will be mailed upon request.

391. **Obscenity: Three Caxe Studies**, (Kelly) June 1978
392. **Access to FDA Information**, (Sinovic) July 1978
393. **FOIA: What's A Trade Secret?** (Hawker) July 1978
394. **Access to Medical Records**, (Cooper) August 1978
395. **The Reporter's Control of News**, (Powell) Sept. 1978
0019 **A Look at Journalism Reviews**, (Bertrand) Sept. 1978
396. **The Camera Comes to Court**, (Floren) Oct. 1978
397. **Public Records and Public Meetings**, (Kelly) Dec. 1978
398. **The Children's Advertising Battle**, (MacKie) Jan. 1979
399. **CATV and the Broadcasters**, (Flanagan) Jan. 1979
400. **Eyeing New York's Newspaper Strike**, (Fishleder) Feb. 1979
401. **Parents Protest Textbooks**, (Hung) March 1979
402. **Press Councils in Canada**, (Reddic) March 1979
403. **The Supreme Court's Search Ruling**, (Kelly), April 1979
404. **Conneticut's FOI Commission**, (Gentry) May 1979
405. **Press Access to Jails and Prisons**, (McCormick) June 1979
406. **Access to NRC Records**, (Kalin) July 1979
407. **A Guide to the EDA**, (Miller) July 1979
408. **Public Files of the SEC**, (Woodward) Aug. 1979
409. **The FTC: A Fount of Business Data**, (Bryant) Sept. 1979
410. **The FCC: A Research Tool**, (Wilson) Sept. 1979
411. **Access to Federal Officials' Papers**, (Schwaller) Oct. 1979
412. **Access to Personal Medical Records**, (Weisenstein) Nov. 1979
413. **Physician Advertising: The Debate**, (Bruhn) Nov. 1979
414. **National Archives and its Archivist**, (Caprino) Dec. 1979
415. **The FCC and the Electric Church** (Abrams) Jan. 1980
416. **Religious Groups v. TV's Sex, Violence**, (Schicht) Jan. 1980
417. **Who Runs Presidential Campaigns? (Kindsvatter) March 1980**
418. **Press Relations: Carter's Example**, Kindsvatter) March 1980
419. **Pressure Groups v. the Movies**, (Froelich) April 1980
420. **Foreign Controls on U.S. Media**, (Ramos) May 1980
421. **The Non-Aligned News Agency Pool**, (Sebaei) May 1980
422. **Florida's Bold Experiment**, (White) June 1980
423. **Free Press-Trial Confusion**, Newman) July 1980
424. **Speaking Freely on Military Bases**, (Kindsvatter) July 1980
425. **Publishing Juvenile Names**, (Hubbard) Aug. 1980
426. **Official Secrecy: Rising or Demising?** (Appleton) Sept. 1980
427. **The American Press Ombudsman**, (Mogavero) Sept. 1980
428. **Access to Congressional Records**, (Relyea) Oct. 1980
429. **Secrecy in Science**, (Bushman, Porter) Nov. 1980
430. **The CIA and Censorship**, (Ruffenach) Nov. 1980
431. **Reporters' Committee for Freedom of the Press**, (Gerstein) Dec. 1980
432. **The CIA-Media Connection**, (Sanderson) Jan. 1981
433. **Soviet Disinformation**, (Cavenagh) Jan. 1981
434. **Litigation Costs and Self Censorship** (Picard) Feb. 1981
435. **Minority Broadcasting Ownership** (Taylor)
436. **Minorities in the Media** (Sherard, Lynch, Heard) Mar. 1981
437. **FoI and Fire at the MGM Grand** (Thompson) April 1981
438. **Canada's Access Legislation** (O'Reilly) May 1981
439. **Access To Computerized Records** (Pfeffer) May 1981
440. **Reporter Licensing** (Henderson) June 1981
441. **An Adoptee's Right to Know** (Abernathy) July 1981
442. **Cryptology and National Security** (Peterson) July 1981
443. **Censorship in Public Schools** (Sneller) Aug. 1981
444. **Voluntary Press-Bar Agreements** (Kirby) Sept. 1981
445. **Missouri Public Service Commission** (Sickendick) Sept. 1981
446. **Prior Restraint and the Progressive** (Wrenden) Oct. 1981
447. **New Zealand's Proposed FoI Law** (Chetwynd) Nov. 1981
448. **Discipline of Foreign Correspondents** (Picard) Nov. 1981
449. **Fair Information Practices Laws** (Kilbourne) Dec. 1981
450. **Proposed FOIA Amendments-1** (Perlmutter) Jan. 1982
451. **Proposed FOIA Amendments-2** (Perlmutter) Jan. 1981
452. **Christians, Consumers and TV** (Gliatto) Feb. 1981
453. **The Plight of the Public Libraries** (Rose) March 1981
454. **Watchdogging the IRS** (Engardio) March 1982
455. **Intelligence Identities Protection** (Sanderson) April 1982
456. **Newspaper Preservation Act Update** (Keep) May 1982
457. **Use of the FOIA** (Archibald) May 1982
458. **Attorneys and Advertising** (Brown) June 1982
459. **FCC and the Sunshine Act** (Weiss) July 1982
460. **High School Press Pressures** (Rogers) July 1982
461. **The Prison Press** (Hausman) Aug. 1982
462. **The Australian Freedom of Information Act** (Chetwynd) Sept. 1982
463. **Business and the Media** (Barchie) Sept. 1982
464. **Reporter's Privilege** (Slasman) Oct. 1982
465. **Columbia Daily Tribune v. The Curators of the University of Missouri: A Case Study** (Watt) Nov. 1982
466. **Functional Illiteracy** (Hovey) Nov. 1982
467. **The Department of Education: A Reporter's Guide**, (Shannon), December 1982.
468. **Declassified Documents**, (Brown) January 1983.
469. **Government Classification: An Overview**, (Brown) January 1983.
470. **Voluntary Becomes Standard?: Bar-Press Codes After 'Swedberg'**, (Kates) February 1983.
471. **Rich News: Metropolitan Dailies and the Urban Poor**, (Draper) March 1983.
472. **Demographics and the Dailies: Stalking the Upscale Reader**, (Hausman) March 1983.
473. **Five Years of Right of Publicity: The Aftermath of 'Zacchini v. Scripps-Howard'**, (List) April 1983.
474. **The Federal Advisory Committee Act After Ten Years**, (Keep) May 1983.
475. **Naming the Rape Victim**, (Clay) May 1983.

476. **Exemption 6: Privacy Under The Freedom of Information Act,** (Abbott) June 1983
477. **Exemption 4: Trade Secrets Under the Freedom of Information Act,** (Selby) July 1983
478. **Pentagon After Action Reports: The Jack Taylor Debate,** (Abbott) July 1983
479. **The Ombudsman and The News Media,** (Hudgens) August 1983

Additional copies of this report, and other Freedom of Information Center reports, may be obtained by writing the Center at Box 858, Columbia, Missouri 65205. There is a $1 charge for each single copy, 90 cents each for 25 or more copies, $60 per 100 copies, and $50 per 100 on orders of 300 or more copies.